

United States Patent and Trademark Office

ENITED STATES DEPAREMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/650,302	08/28/2003	Yukiko Kubota	S01.12-0965/STL 11036.00	6926
75.90 04:04/2005			EXAMINER	
David C. Bohn			RICKMAN, HOLLY C	
Westman, Chan	nplin & Kelly			
Suite 1600			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
900 Second Avenue South			1773	
Minneapolis, MN 55402-3319			DATE MAILED: 04/04/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Comments	10/650,302	KUBOTA ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Holly Rickman	1773				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appeared for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a rep - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ting ly within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from e, cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 J	anuary 2005.					
2a)⊠ This action is FINAL . 2b)☐ This	s action is non-final.					
	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
 4) Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-6,8-22 and 25-28 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) 7,23-24 is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or 	wn from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accomposed and applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine 11.	cepted or b) objected to by the lideration of the lideration of the drawing of the drawing (s) is objected to by the lideration is required if the drawing (s) is objected to by the lideration is required if the drawing (s) is objected to by the lideration is required if the drawing (s) is objected to by the lideration of the lideration is required if the drawing (s) is objected to by the lideration of the	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	•					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Burea * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	ts have been received. Is have been received in Applicationity documents have been received u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage				
		,				
Attachment(s)						
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	•				

Application/Control Number: 10/650,302

Art Unit: 1773

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The rejection of claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, is withdrawn in view of Applicant's arguments.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 1-6, 8-22, and 25-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carey et al. (US 2003/0022023) in view of Shimizu et al. (US 2002/0004148).

Carey et al. teach a magnetic recording medium having a seedlayer formed from a Cu-IrMn laminate, a multilayered soft magnetic layer formed from CoFe layers separated by nonmagnetic coupling layers and a magnetic recording layer thereon. The reference teaches that the easy axis orientation is circumferential and the soft magnetic underlayer is devoid of domain walls (paragraphs 3, 5, 10, 12, 14, 16, 28, 30). With respect to the claim limitation directed to a magnetic moment greater than 1.7 T, it is the Examiner's contention that the CoFe soft magnetic layers taught by Carey et al. inherently satisfy this limitation by virtue of the fact that magnetic moment is a material property and Applicant's teach using the same material.

Carey et al. is silent with respect to the texturing of the soft magnetic underlayer to provide circumferential easy axis orientation.

Shimizu et al. teaches circumferentially texturing a substrate beneath a soft magnetic underlayer in a recording structure in order to effect texturing of the soft magnetic layer thereby reducing spike noise (see paragraph 34).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to circumferentially texture the substrate taught by Carey et al. in order to provide a soft magnetic underlayer having texture, thereby decreasing spike noise.

Allowable Subject Matter

4. Claims 7 and 23-24 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed 1/7/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

With respect to the rejection of the claims over Carey et al. in view of Shimizu et al.,

Applicant argues that Carey et al. does not teach "Fe65Co35 soft magnetic layers. Furthermore,

Applicant contends that "[m]agnetic properties of soft magnetic materials are not determined

solely by material composition, but are also determined by processing conditions." Thus,

Applicant maintains that Carey et al. does not inherently teach the claim limitation directed to a magnetic moment having a value greater than 1.7 T.

The Examiner agrees that Carey et al. does not teach a "Fe65Co35" soft magnetic layer. The reference does teach a CoFe material. CoFe or FeCo is a soft magnetic material as evidenced by Applicant's specification which teaches using FeCo as a soft magnetic material of the disclosed invention. The Examiner maintains the position that the disclosure of a FeCo alloy inherently satisfies the claim limitations directed to magnetic moment. Applicant argues that "magnetic properties" of soft magnetic materials are not merely material properties. However, Applicant's arguments and the reference cited therein do not address the specific magnetic property set forth in the claims. There is no evidence of record to establish that one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that magnetic moment is anything other than a material property.

6. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 1773

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Holly Rickman whose telephone number is (571) 272-1514. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Carol Chaney can be reached on (571) 272-1284. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Holly Rickman
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1773

March 29, 2005